



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,097	10/23/2003	Alexander E. Vaschillo	13768.462	6556
47973 7590 10/30/2009 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
EXAMINER				
MACILWINEN, JOHN MOORE JAIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2442				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/30/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/692,097

**Applicant(s)**

VASCHILLO ET AL.

**Examiner**

John M. MacIwinen

**Art Unit**

2442

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5510E)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/23/2003, 12/21/2007, 6/26/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 18 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Said claims are directed to a “computer-readable media” and “computer program product”. However, on pages 13 – 14 of Applicant’s specification, Applicant states in [32] that “computer-readable media can comprise . . . any other media which can be used to carry or store desired program code” where [33] continues by stating that “When information is transferred over a network communications connection either hardwired [or] wireless . . . any such connection . . . should be included in the scope of computer readable media. Thus Applicant’s claims 18 – 45 appear to be directed to non-statutory subject matter such as wireless signals, transmissions, etc.
3. Claim(s) 1- 17, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory “process” under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385. The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 18 – 19, 33, 44, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Luzeski (US 6,404,762 B1).

6. Regarding claim 1, Luzeski shows in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, a method for creating an electronic message that can be stored and accessed with increased efficiency, the method comprising:

an act of creating a message item representing the electronic message in accordance with a message schema, the message item having one or more general properties that may be common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and message applications (said message schema represented by the CMC message structure of Luzeski; cols. 15 – 16 and col. 18 lines 62 – 64);

an act of assigning a primary type to the created message item, the primary type indicating a primary behavior of one or more content portions linked to the created message item (col. 14 lines 28 – 45);

an act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item, each assigned protocol extension adding one or more protocol specific properties to the created message item so as to promote compatibility between the one or more

linked content portions and a specified message protocol (Luzeski showing where reading a messages gives information showing if, for example, the VMMM system should be interacted with (col. 11 lines 20 - 65) or information showing where the message is email and thus a different system should be interacted with (Fig. 1));

and an act of assigning one or more application extensions to the created message item, each assigned application extension adding one or more application specific properties to the created message item so as to promote compatibility (col. 17 lines 1 - 50 showing, for example, 'compatibility' between a header and the corresponding container with the messages stored content) between the one or more linked content portions and a specified message application (Fig. 2 and col. 16 lines 64 - 67).

7. Regarding claim 2, Luzeski shows the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of creating a message item representing the electronic message comprises an act of creating a message item representing the electronic message in accordance with a message schema, the message item having one or more general properties that are common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and message applications (col. 10 lines 50 – 67 and col. 15 line 55 - col. 16 line 15).

8. Regarding claim 3, Luzeski shows wherein the an act of assigning a primary type to the created message item comprises an act of assigning a primary type to the created message item, the primary type being selected from among electronic mail message (Fig. 1), instant message, fax message, voice message (Fig. 1), news group posting

9. Regarding claim 4, Luzeski shows wherein the act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item, the one or more protocol extensions being selected at least from among electronic mail protocol extensions, instant messaging protocol extensions, fax protocol extensions, voice message protocol extensions and, news group posting protocol extensions (Fig. 1 and col. 11 lines 20 – 65).

10. Regarding claim 9, Luzeski shows wherein the act of assigning one or more application extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning one or more application extensions to the created message item, the one or more application extensions being selected at least from among electronic mail application extensions, instant messaging application extensions, fax application extensions, voice message application extensions, and news group posting application extensions (col. 25 lines 29 – 31).

11. Regarding claim 11, Luzeski shows wherein the act of assigning one or more application extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning an application extension defined in accordance with an application extension schema (col. 16 lines 64 - 67 and Fig. 2).

12. Regarding claim 18, Luzeski shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing an electronic message, the data structure comprising:

a general properties field representing common electronic message properties

that are common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications (col. 15 line 55 – col. 60 line 50, col. 18 lines 18 – 20, col. 14 lines 28 – 34 and col. 24 lines 22 – 40) ; and

at least one protocol specific property field, the at least one protocol specific property field representing one or more protocol specific message properties that correspond to a specific message protocol (Fig. 1, col. 11 lines 20 - 65, col. 15 lines 48 - 50, col. 24 line 40 - col. 25 line 55), the specific message protocol being selecting from among the plurality of different types of message protocols that have the common electronic message properties represented in the general properties field in common (col. 11 lines 9 – 30, col. 10 lines 60 - 68).

13. Regarding claim 19, Luzeski shows wherein the at least one protocol specific property field comprises: a protocol specific property field representing one or more protocol specific message properties that correspond to one of an electronic mail protocol, an instant messaging protocol, a fax protocol, a voice message protocol, or a news group protocol (col. 24 line 40 – col. 25 line 55).

14. Regarding claim 33, Luzeski shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing a message schema, the data structure comprising:

a general properties field defining a format for representing electronic message properties that may be common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications (represented by the CMC message structure, cols. 15 – 16 and col. 18 lines 62 – 64);

at least one protocol specific property field, the at least one protocol specific property field defining a format for representing protocol specific electronic message properties that correspond to a specific message protocol from among the different types of message protocols (Fig. 1 and col. 11 lines 20 - 65, for example where email has the property that it interacts with specific subsystems), the message schema including or referring to a protocol extension schema that defines the format for representing at least one protocol specific property field (col. 15 lines 20 - 43); and

at least one application specific property field, the at least one application specific property field defining a format for representing application specific electronic message properties that correspond to a specific message application from among the different types of message applications, the message schema including or referring to an application extension schema that defines the format for representing at least one application specific property field (col. 16 lines 40 - 67, col. 17 lines 15 - 54, col. 18 lines 4 - 20, col. 24 line 38 - col. 25 line 67).

15. Regarding claim 44, Luzeski shows a computer program product for use in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, the computer program product for implementing a method for creating an electronic message that can be stored and accessed with increased efficiency, the computer program product comprising one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon computer executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the computer system to perform the following:

create a message item representing the electronic message in accordance with a



message schema, the message item having one or more general properties that are common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and message applications (said message schema represented by the CMC message structure of Luzeski; cols. 15 – 16 and col. 18 lines 62 – 64);

assign a primary type to the created message item, the primary type indicating a primary behavior of one or more content portions linked to the created message item; assign one or more protocol extensions to the created message item (col. 14 lines 28 – 45),

each assigned protocol extension adding one or more protocol specific properties to the created message item so as to promote compatibility between the one or more linked content portions and a specified message protocol (Luzeski showing where reading a messages gives information showing if, for example, the VMMM system should be interacted with (col. 11 lines 20 - 65) or information showing where the message is email and thus a different system should be interacted with (Fig. 1)); and

assign one or more application extensions to the created message item, each assigned application extension adding one or more application specific properties to the created message item so as to promote compatibility (col. 17 lines 1 - 50 showing, for example, 'compatibility' between a header and the corresponding container with the messages stored content) between the one or more linked content portions and a specified message application (Fig. 2 and col. 16 lines 64 - 67).

16. Regarding claim 46, Luzeski shows in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, a method for

processing an electronic message attachment, the method comprising:

an act of receiving an electronic message that includes a schematized attachment, one or more fields of the schematized attachment storing values that indicate how the attachment is to be processed (col. 16 lines 50 – 67);

an act of query at least one field of the schematized attachment to access a stored value (col. 18 lines 3 – 39); and

an act of processing the schematized attachment according to the accessed value (col. 18 lines 3 – 39).

17. Regarding claim 47, Luzeski shows in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, a method for creating an electronic message that can be stored and accessed with increased efficiency, the method comprising:

an act of creating a message item representing the electronic message in accordance with a message schema, the message item having one or more general properties that may be common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and message applications (said message schema represented by the CMC message structure of Luzeski; cols. 15 – 16 and col. 18 lines 62 – 64);

an act of assigning a primary type to the created message item, the primary type indicating a primary behavior of one or more content portions linked to the created message item (col. 14 lines 28 – 43); and

a step for customizing the message according to one or more message extensions so as to cause the message item to be compatible with components that

process data formatted in accordance with the one or more message extensions (col. 18 lines 18 – 33, col. 18 lines 34 – 63).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 5 – 7, 12 – 17, 20 – 22 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luzeski in view of Guck (5,794,039), hereafter Guck1, where 5,911,776, hereafter Guck2 and 5,848,415, hereafter Guck3 and 5,848,415, where Gucks 2 and 3 are each incorporated by reference into Guck1.

20. Regarding claim 5, Luzeski shows claim 1.

Luzeski does not show wherein the act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning a POP3 protocol extension to the created message item.

Guck shows wherein the act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning a POP3 protocol extension to the created message item (Guck1, col. 10 lines 47 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Guck1 in order to improve the resulting systems ability to manage and manipulate files of differing formats and protocols (Guck1, Abstract).

21. Regarding claim 6, Luzeski shows claim 3.

Luzeski does not show wherein the act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning an NNTP protocol extension to the created message item.

Guck shows wherein the act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning an NNTP protocol extension to the created message item (Guck1, col. 10 lines 47 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Guck1 in order to improve the resulting systems ability to manage and manipulate files of differing formats and protocols (Guck1, Abstract).

22. Regarding claim 7, Luzeski shows claim 3.

Luzeski does not show wherein the act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning a community news protocol extension to the created message item.

Guck shows wherein the act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning a community news protocol extension to the created message item (Guck1, col. 10 lines 46 - 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Guck1 in order to improve the resulting systems ability to manage and manipulate files of differing formats and protocols (Guck1, Abstract).

23. Regarding claims 12 and 45, Luzeski shows in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, a method for transforming an electronic message, which was created in accordance with a message schema, for compatibility with a message extension as well as

a computer program product for use in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, the computer program product for implementing a method for transforming an electronic message, which was created in accordance with a message schema, for compatibility with a message extension, the computer program product comprising one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon computer executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the computer system to perform the following

an act of accessing a message item representing the electronic message, the message item having the one or more general properties that may be common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications (Luzeski, col. 15 and 16 and col. 18 lines 62 – 64), the message item also having one or more currently assigned specific properties, the currently assigned specific properties being specific to at least one currently assigned message extension (Luzeski, Fig. 1 and col. 11 lines 55 - 68);

Luzeski does not show all of: an act of assigning a new message extension to the message item, the new message extension having one or more new specific properties that are to be associated with the message item

an act of retrieving at least one value from the one or more currently assigned

specific properties; and

an act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the new specific properties to promote compatibility with the new message extension and where said content is then assigned a new format to maintain compatibility with a new subtype

Guck shows an act of assigning a new message extension to the message item, the new message extension having one or more new specific properties that are to be associated with the message item (view converting between formats and protocols resulting in an output file/object with a new extension/schema; see Guck3 col. 5 lines 5 – 10, col. 6 lines 20 – 25, col. 6 lines 52 – 55 and col. 10 lines 18 – 20; along with Guck3, col. 8 lines 3 – 13 and col. 8 lines 48 – 55, showing where the messages new subtypes have new specific properties);

an act of retrieving at least one value from the one or more currently assigned specific properties; and

an act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the new specific properties to promote compatibility with the new message extension (Guck3, Abstract lines 1 - 8, col. 6 lines 52 - 55, col. 12 lines 5 - 10 and col. 11 lines 48 - 55; showing retrieving content, and showing where content which is stored, retrieved and processed based on a current subtype (col. 13 lines 59 – 61 of Guck2) and where said content is then assigned a new format to maintain compatibility with a new subtype (see Guck2, col. 1 lines 38 – 58, col. 3 lines 59 – 63, col. 8 lines 10 – 13, col. 9 lines 1 - 31, and col. 15 lines 28 - 30)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Guck1 in order to improve the resulting systems ability to manage and manipulate files of differing formats and protocols (Guck1, Abstract).

24. Regarding claim 13, Luzeski in view of Guck further show wherein the act of accessing a message item representing the electronic message, the message item having the one or more general properties that may be common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications comprises an act of accessing a message item representing the electronic message, the message item having the one or more general properties that are common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications (Luzeski, col. 10 lines 50 – 67 and col. 15 line 55 – col. 16 line 15).

25. Regarding claim 14, Luzeski in view of Guck further show wherein the act of assigning a new message extension to the message item comprises an act of assigning a new message extension, the new message extension being selected at least from among electronic mail protocol extensions, instant messaging protocol extensions, fax protocol extensions, voice message protocol extensions and, news group posting protocol extensions, electronic mail application extensions, instant messaging application extensions, fax application extensions, voice message application extensions, and news group posting application extensions (Luzeski, Fig. 1).

26. Regarding claim 15, Luzeski in view of Guck further show wherein an act of retrieving at least one value from the one or more existing specific properties comprises

on act of retrieving one or more existing specified properties from a message item that represents one of an electronic mail message, a fax message, an instant message, a voice message, or a news group posting (Luzeski, Fig. 1 and col. 11 lines 55 – 68).

27. Regarding claim 16, Luzeski in view of Guck further show wherein the act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the new specific properties comprises an act of assigning a value retrieved from one of a currently assigned electronic mail message extension, a currently assigned fax message extension, a currently assigned instant message extension, a currently assigned voice message extension, or a currently assigned news group posting extension, to one of a newly assigned electronic mail message extension, a newly assigned fax message extension, a newly assigned instant message extension, a newly assigned voice message extension, or a new assigned news group posting extension (Guck3, col. 4 lines 35 – 46, col. 9 line 63 – col. 10 line 20 and col. 12 lines 26 – 55).

Regarding claim 17, Luzeski shows in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, a method for transforming an electronic message, which was created in accordance with a message schema (Luzeski, cols. 15 and 16 and col. 18 lines 62 - 64), for compatibility with a message extension, the method comprising:

an act of accessing a message item representing the electronic message, the message item having the one or more general properties that may be common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications (Luzeski, col. 14 lines 28 - 34, col. 18 lines 18 – 20, col. 20 lines



22 - 65, col. 24 line 40 – col. 25 line 55), the message item also having one or more currently assigned specific properties, the currently assigned specific properties being specific to at least one currently assigned message extension (Luzeski, col. 11 lines 55 – 68 and Fig. 1);

Luzeski does not show a step for using values of currently assigned extension specific fields to translate the electronic message for compatibility with a new message extension.

Guck shows a step for using values of currently assigned extension specific fields (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 50, col. 13 lines 15 - 36, col. 15 lines 63 - 64, col. 15 lines 25 - 27) to translate the electronic message for compatibility with a new message extension (Guck2 col. 1 lines 38 – 58, col. 3 lines 59 – 63, col. 8 lines 10 – 13, col. 9 lines 1 – 31, col. 13 lines 59 – 61, col. 15 lines 28 - 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Guck1 in order to improve the resulting systems ability to manage and manipulate files of differing formats and protocols (Guck1, Abstract).

28. Regarding claim 20, Luzeski shows claim 18.

Luzeski does not show the one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing an electronic message, as recited in claim 18, the data structure further comprising:

at least one application specific property field, the at least one application specific property field representing one or more application specific electronic message

properties that correspond to a specific message application, the specific message application being selecting from among the plurality of different types of message applications that have the common electronic message properties represented in the general properties field in common (Guck2 col. 14 lines 15 – 25 and lines 40 – 45 and col. 15 lines 34 – 35 and 50 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Guck1 in order to improve the resulting systems ability to manage and manipulate files of differing formats and protocols (Guck1, Abstract).

29. Regarding claim 21, Luzeski shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing an electronic message, the data structure comprising:

a general properties field representing common electronic message properties that are common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications (Luzeski, col. 11 lines 55 – 68 and Fig. 1 and col. 15 line 55 – col. 16 line 50); and

Luzeski does not show at least one application specific property field, the at least one application specific property field representing one or more application specific electronic message properties that correspond to a specific message application, the specific message application being selecting from among the plurality of different types of message applications that have the common electronic message properties represented in the general properties field in common (Guck2 col. 14 lines 15 – 25 and

lines 40 – 45 and col. 15 lines 34 – 35 and 50 – 65).

Guck shows at least one application specific property field, the at least one application specific property field representing one or more application specific electronic message properties that correspond to a specific message application, the specific message application being selecting from among the plurality of different types of message applications that have the common electronic message properties represented in the general properties field in common (Guck2 col. 14 lines 15 – 25 and lines 40 – 45 and col. 15 lines 34 – 35 and 50 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Guck1 in order to improve the resulting systems ability to manage and manipulate files of differing formats and protocols (Guck1, Abstract).

30. Regarding claim 22, Luzeski in view of Guck further show the The one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing an electronic message as recited in claim 21, wherein the at least one application specific property field comprises: an application specific property field representing one or more application specific message properties that correspond to one of an electronic mail application, an instant messaging application, a fax application, a voice message application, or a news group application (Guck2, col. 15 lines 34 - 35 and col. 15 lines 40 - 55).

31. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luzeski in view of Xue (US 6,782,414 B1).

32. Regarding claim, Luzeski shows claim 1.

Luzeski does not show wherein the an act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning a protocol extension defined in accordance with a protocol extension schema.

Xue shows wherein the an act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning a protocol extension defined in accordance with a protocol extension schema (Fig. 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Xue in order to further expand on the support of multiple communications protocols (Xue, col. 2 lines 50 – 62).

33. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luzeski in view of Outlook (Outlook Express EML, Computing.net, December 2002).

34. Regarding claim, Luzeski shows claim 9.

Luzeski does not show wherein the act of assigning one or more application extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning an Microsoft.RTM. Outlook.RTM. Express application extension to the created message item.

Outlook shows wherein the act of assigning one or more application extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning an Microsoft.RTM. Outlook.RTM. Express application extension to the created message item (pgs. 1 – 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Outlook in order to support a commonly utilized messaging format (Outlook, pgs. 1 – 5).

35. Claims 23, 24, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luzeski in view of Lee (US 6,212,553 B1) and Kennedy (6,134,582).

36. Regarding claim 23, Luzeski shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure for representing an electronic message, the data structure comprising:

- an ID field representing an identifier that identifies the electronic message within an message database (col. 15 lines 60 – 61 and col. 16 lines 18 - 20);

- a primary type field representing a primary message type of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field, the primary message type implying a behavior of the electronic message (col. 15 lines 25 – 31 and col. 16 line 5);

- at least one MessageParticipant relationship field representing links to one or more message participants associated with the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (col. 15 lines 65 – 66 and col. 16 line 9);

- at least one MessageContents relationship field representing links to one or more portions of message content corresponding to the electronic message electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (col. 16 line 10 and col. 16 lines 64 – 68);

Luzeski does not show at least one sent message folder relationship field representing links to one or more message folders the electronic message identified by

the identifier represented in the ID field is to be moved to after being submitted for delivery; and

a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Lee shows at least one sent message folder relationship field representing links to one or more message folders the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field is to be moved to after being submitted for delivery (col. 32 lines 50 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Lee in order to ensure that a users sent messages are properly organized and stored.

Luzeski in view of Lee do not show a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Kennedy shows a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski in view of Lee with that of Kennedy in order to better track a messages retrieval status.

37. Regarding claim 24, Luzeski in view of Lee and Kennedy further show message status field representing the status of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Lee, Fig. 11).

38. Regarding claim 34, Luzeski shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure for representing an electronic message, the data structure comprising:

a primary type field defining a format for representing a primary message type corresponding to an electronic message, the primary message type implying a behavior of the electronic message (col. 15 lines 25 - 31 and col. 16 line 5)

a participants relationship field defining a format for representing links to message participants, the message participants being associated with the electronic message having a primary message type defined in accordance with the primary message type format in the primary type field (col.15 lines 65 - 66 and col. 16 line 9)

a contents relationship field defining a format for representing links to one or more portions of message content, the one or more portions of message content corresponding to the electronic message electronic message having a primary message type defined in accordance with the primary message type format in the primary type field (col. 16 line 10 and col. 16 lines 64 – 68);

Luzeski does not show at least one sent message folder relationship field representing links to one or more message folders the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field is to be moved to after being submitted for delivery; and

a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Lee shows at least one sent message folder relationship field representing links

to one or more message folders the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field is to be moved to after being submitted for delivery (col. 32 lines 50 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski with that of Lee in order to ensure that a users sent messages are properly organized and stored.

Luzeski in view of Lee do not show a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Kennedy shows a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski in view of Lee with that of Kennedy in order to better track a messages retrieval status.

39. Regarding claim 35, Luzeski in view of Lee and Kennedy further show a message status field defining a format for representing the status of the electronic message having a primary message type defined in accordance with the primary message type format in the primary type field, the message schema including or referring to a message status schema that defines the format for representing the status of the electronic message (Lee, Fig. 11).

40. Claim 25 and 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luzeski in view of Lee and Kennedy, further in view of Almond (6,112,024) .



41. Regarding claims 25 and 36, Luzeski in view of Lee and Kennedy show claims 23 and 24, including wherein the message status field is comprised of:

an IsRead field representing an indication of whether or not the electronic message is identified by the identifier represented in the ID field has been marked as read (Lee, Figs. 11 and 14); and

a SendStatus field representing an indication of the send status of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Lee, Fig. 11 and col. 32 lines 50 – 55).

Luzeski in view of Lee and Kennedy do not show a LastActionTaken field representing an indication of the last action that was taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field;

a LastActionTime field representing the time that the last action indicated in the LastActionTaken field was taken;

a LastActionType field representing the type of that last action taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Almond shows a LastActionTaken field representing an indication of the last action that was taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field;

a LastActionTime field representing the time that the last action indicated in the LastActionTaken field was taken;

a LastActionType field representing the type of that last action taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Fig. 7C).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Luzeski in view of Lee and Kennedy with that of Almond in order to better manage document changes, enabling additional document management options (Almond, Abstract, cols. 1 – 2).

42. Claims 26, 27, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of RFC 2046 (MIME Part Two: Media Types, November 1996).

43. Regarding claim 26, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing a portion of message content, the data structure comprising:

an electronic message relationship field representing a link to an electronic message, the link indicating that the portion of message content is associated with an electronic message (Guck1, col. 7 lines 8 – 30, col. 9 lines 20 – 47 and col. 12 lines 18 – 67); and

a content type field representing a content type corresponding to the portion of message content (Guck2, col. 16 lines 12 – 25).

Guck does not show an order field representing an order value, the order value indicating how the portion of message content is to be ordered with respect to other portions of message content that are also associated with the electronic message; and

a content properties field representing additional properties of the content type represented in the content type field.

RFC 2046 shows an order field representing an order value, the order value

indicating how the portion of message content is to be ordered with respect to other portions of message content that are also associated with the electronic message; and

a content properties field representing additional properties of the content type represented in the content type field (5.2.2.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of RFC 2046 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol as well as to follow the practices encouraged by Guck (Guck2, col. 2 lines 60 – 66).

44. Regarding claim 27, Guck in view of RFC 2046 further show wherein the content properties field comprises: an attachment type field representing an attachment type of the portion of message content (RFC 2046, 5.2.2.2).

45. Regarding claim 37, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing a message content schema, the data structure comprising:

a content type field defining a format for representing the content type of a portion of content included in an electronic message (Guck2, col. 16 lines 12 – 25); and

a content type metadata field representing content metadata corresponding to the portion of content (Guck2, col. 16 lines 12 – 25) included in the electronic message having a content type defined in accordance with the content type format in the content type field, the message content schema including or referring to a content properties schema (Guck1, col. 7 lines 22 – 33 and Guck2, col. 5 lines 30 – 48)

Guck does not show an order field defining a format for representing the order of

the portion of content included in the electronic message having a content type defined in accordance with the content type format in the content type field and

where said content type field defines the format for representing the content metadata corresponding to the portion of content

RFC 2046 shows an order field defining a format for representing the order of the portion of content included in the electronic message having a content type defined in accordance with the content type format in the content type field (RFC 2046, 5.2.2.2); and

where said content type field defines the format for representing the content metadata corresponding to the portion of content (RFC 2046, Sections 4 – 4.5, 5.1, 5.2 and 5.2.2.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of RFC 2046 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol as well as to follow the practices encouraged by Guck (Guck2, col. 2 lines 60 – 66).

46. Regarding claim 38, Guck in view of RFC 2046 further show wherein the content type metadata field comprises: an attachment type field representing an attachment type of the portion of content included in the electronic message, the format of the attachment status field being defined in the included or referred to content properties schema (RFC 2046, 5.2.2.2).

47. Claims 28 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of RFC 2046 as applied to claims 26 and 37 above, further in view of RFC 2017 (Definition of the URL MIME External-Body Access-Type, October 1996).

48. Regarding claims 28, Guck in view of RFC 2046 show claim 26.

Guck in view of RFC 2046 do not show a MIME URL field representing a link to a MIME path that corresponds to the portion of message content.

RFC 2017 shows a MIME URL field representing a link to a MIME path that corresponds to the portion of message content (pgs. 1 – 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of RFC 2046 with that of RFC 2017 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol.

49. Regarding claim 39, Guck in view of RFC 2046 show claim 37.

Guck in view of RFC 2046 do not show wherein the content type metadata field comprises: a MIME URL field representing a link to MIME path that corresponds to the content portion of the electronic message, the format of the MIME URL field being defined in the included or referred to content properties schema.

RFC 2017 shows wherein the content type metadata field comprises: a MIME URL field representing a link to MIME path that corresponds to the content portion of the electronic message, the format of the MIME URL field being defined in the included or referred to content properties schema (RFC 2017, pgs. 1 – 4 and RFC 2046, Section 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of RFC 2046 with that of RFC 2017 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol.

50. Claims 29 and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Chao (US 2004/0128355 A1).

51. Regarding claim 29, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure for representing a message attachment, the data structure comprising:

an electronic message relationship field representing a link to a message item, the link indicating that the message attachment is associated with the message item (Guck1, col. 7 lines 8 – 30, col. 9 lines 20 – 47 and col. 12 lines 18 - 67);

a type field representing a message type of the electronic message linked to by the link represented in the electronic message link field, the message type implying a behavior of the electronic message (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 25 and col. 15 lines 50 - 55);

and an attachment state field representing the type and behavior of the message attachment (Guck2, col. 16 lines 12 – 25).

Guck does not show an IsPinned field representing the deletion status of the message attachment with respect to the electronic message linked to by the link represented in the electronic message link field; and

an IsTrusted field representing trust information related to the message attachment.

Chao shows an IsPinned field representing the deletion status of the message

attachment with respect to the electronic message linked to by the link represented in the electronic message link field ([29]) and

an IsTrusted field representing trust information related to the message attachment ([12, 40-43] and Fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of Chao in order to better manage and classify messages (Chao, [11]).

52. Regarding claim 40, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing an attachment schema, the data structure comprising:

a type field defining a format for representing a message type corresponding to an electronic message, the message type implying a behavior of the electronic message (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 25 and col. 15 lines 50 – 55); and

an attachment state field defining a format for representing the type and behavior of the corresponding attachment (Guck2, col. 16 lines 12 – 25).

Guck does not show an IsPinned field defining a format for representing the deletion status of a corresponding message attachment with respect to the electronic message and

an IsTrusted field defining a format for representing trust information related to the corresponding message attachment.

Chao shows an IsPinned field defining a format for representing the deletion status of a corresponding message attachment with respect to the electronic message

(Chao, [29]);

an IsTrusted field defining a format for representing trust information related to the corresponding message attachment (Chao, [12, 40-43] and Fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of Chao in order to better manage and classify messages (Chao, [11]).

53. Claims 30, 31, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Chao as applied to claims 29 and 40 above, and further in view of RFC 2017.

54. Regarding claim 30, Guck in view of Chao show claim 29.

Guck in view of Chao do not show an attachment source relationship field representing a link to a database item where the message attachment was accessed.

RFC 2017 shows an attachment source relationship field representing a link to a database item where the message attachment was accessed (pg. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of Chao with that of RFC 2017 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol.

55. Regarding claim 31, Guck in view of Chao and RFC 2017 further show a saved from relationship field representing a link to the message attachment (RFC 2017, pg. 1).

56. Regarding claim 41, Guck in view of Chao show claim 40.

Guck in view of Chao do not show an attachment source relationship field representing a link to a database item where the message attachment was accessed.



RFC 2017 shows an attachment source relationship field representing a link to a database item where the message attachment was accessed (pg. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of Chao with that of RFC 2017 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol.

57. Regarding claim 42, Guck in view of Chao and RFC 2017 further show a saved from field relationship field defining a format for representing a link to the corresponding attachment. (RFC 2017, pg. 1).

58. Claims 32 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of NNTP (S. Barber, January 2002).

59. Regarding claim 32, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing a community news folder, the data structure comprising:

a communities last refresh field representing the last time the community dynamic properties of the news group community including the collection of synchronized article IDs represented in the community range field was refreshed (Guck1, col. 16 lines 8 – 12 and col. 8 lines 35 – 60).

Guck does not show a community range field representing a collection of article ID ranges from a news group community that have been synchronized with community header properties;

a low article ID field representing a low article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field; and

a high article ID field representing a high article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field.

NNTP shows a community range field representing a collection of article ID ranges from a news group community that have been synchronized with community header properties (9.5.1.1);

a low article ID field representing a low article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field (9.1.1.1); and

a high article ID field representing a high article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field (9.1.1.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of NNTP in order to utilize a standard protocol for the purpose for which it was designed (that is, use Network News Protocol to process and manage network news).

60. Regarding claim 43, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing a community news folder, the data structure comprising:

a communities last refresh field representing the last time the community dynamic properties of the news group community including the collection of synchronized article IDs represented in the community range field was refreshed (Guck1, col. 16 lines 8 – 12 and col. 8 lines 35 – 60).

Guck does not show a community range field representing a collection of article ID ranges from a news group community that have been synchronized with community

header properties;

a low article ID field representing a low article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field; and

a high article ID field representing a high article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field.

NNTP shows a community range field representing a collection of article ID ranges from a news group community that have been synchronized with community header properties (9.5.1.1);

a low article ID field representing a low article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field (9.1.1.1); and

a high article ID field representing a high article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field (9.1.1.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of NNTP in order to utilize a standard protocol for the purpose for which it was designed (that is, use Network News Protocol to process and manage network news).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. MacIwinen whose telephone number is (571) 272-9686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 5:00PM EST; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joon Hwang can be reached on (571) 272 - 4036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John MacIlwinen

(571) 272 – 9686

/Joon H. Hwang/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2447